

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 13, 19, and 23-44 were previously canceled. Claim 15 is canceled. Claims 4, 5, 7, 9-11, 16, 17, 21, 45, and 46 are withdrawn from prosecution. Claims 6, 8, 12, 14, 18, 20 and 22 remain in the application. Reconsideration of the application in view of the remarks to follow is requested.

The Abstract is objected to for having more than 150 words. The Abstract is amended to be within the appropriate range of words, and therefore, the objection is rendered moot.

Claims 6, 8, 12, 14, 18 and 22 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3, 6, 8, 13, 20 and 22 of U.S. Application Serial No. 09/148,723 in view of PCT Publication WO98/12738. This obviousness-type double patenting rejection is inappropriate and should be withdrawn. Pursuant to 35 USC §121, “[a] patent issuing on an application with respect to which a requirement for restriction under this section has been made, or on an application filed as a result of such a requirement, shall not be used as a reference either in the Patent and Trademark Office....” *see also*, MPEP §804.01 (8<sup>th</sup> Ed.). The present application is a divisional application of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/148,723 wherein the present application was restricted out by a requirement of the Patent and Trademark Office (see parent file 09/148,723 at paper no. 5). Accordingly, pursuant to the above authority, U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/148,723 can not be used as a reference for the obviousness-type double

patenting rejection. Therefore, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

Claim 14 is objected to under 37 CFR §1.75 for being a substantial duplicate of claim 15. Claim 15 is canceled rendering the objection moot.

Claims 6, 8, 12, 14, 18 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness, and particularly refers to claims 12 and 18. Claims 12 and 18 are amended to positively recite to "respective ones of the individual bond pads". Moreover, claim 18 is also amended to provide antecedent basis for "absence of flux". Accordingly, the §112, second paragraph rejection is rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

No other rejections are presented against the claims, and therefore, claims 6, 8, 12, 14, 18, 20 and 22 are allowable.

This application is now believed to be in immediate condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview prior to issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9-4-03

By:



D. Brent Kenady  
Reg. No. 40,045